

Remarks

The Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of Claim 46.

The Applicants have added new Claims 47 – 54. New Claim 47 is substantially similar to Claim 46 except that it simplifies the claimed steps. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 47 is also allowable over the prior art.

Claims 48 – 54 also depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 47 and should be allowable for the same reasons. Confirmation of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Applicants acknowledge the rejection of Claims 30 – 35 and 37 – 39 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Hurley. Claim 30 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 34. Claim 34 has been cancelled. The Applicants respectfully submit that Hurley is inapplicable to those claims inasmuch Hurley teaches “an oligomer obtained by condensation of phenol or a phenol derivative (precursor a) and an aliphatic hydrocarbon with two double bonds (precursor b).” However, Hurley fails to teach or suggest “a product with one molecule of the precursor b added to two molecules of the precursor a accounts for 40 wt% or more in the component [D]” as set forth in Claim 30. The importance of this aspect of Claim 30 is set forth in the Applicants’ Specification at page 23, lines 11 to page 24, line 3 as follows:

A composition especially excellent as the component [B] in the molding material of the present invention is such that a product with one molecule of the precursor b added to two molecules of the precursor a (hereinafter called “2:1 additional product” accounts for 40 wt% or more in the component [B]. Since one molecule of a low polar aliphatic hydrocarbon is added to two molecules of high polar phenol or phenol derivative, the composition as a whole is relatively high in polarity and is excellent in the affinity with a highly polar polyamide with amido groups, etc. It is only required that the 2:1 addition product is contained as a main ingredient by 40 wt% or more in the component [B], and for example, a 1:1 addition product, a 2:2 addition product and other impurities may be additionally contained.

In sharp contrast, Hurley discloses “R₃E, wherein R is an unsubstituted 3- or 4-hydrophenyl radical and E is a trivalent C₆- or C₁₀-aryl radical.” “R₃E” is “an oligomer obtained by condensation of phenol or phenol derivative (precursor a) and an aliphatic hydrocarbon with two double bonds (precursor b).” However, it is not “a product with one molecule of the precursor b added to two molecules of the precursor a accounts for 40 wt% or more in the component [D]” from Claim 30. Also, Hurley fails to teach or suggest the surprising advantages of the invention as recited in Claim 30 and as stated above. Inasmuch as Hurley fails to disclose this important aspect of the invention, the Applicants respectfully submit that Hurley is inapplicable under §102. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Applicants acknowledge the rejection of Claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Hurley. The Applicants respectfully submit that Hurley is also inapplicable to Claim 36 in view of the amendment to Claim 30. Withdrawal of the §103 rejection of Claim 36 is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire Application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750

TDC:lh
(215) 656-3381